| | Case 5:09-cv-02087-RMW Document 30 Filed 11/10/09 Page 1 of 2 | |
|----|--|--|
| | | |
| 1 | | |
| 2 | | |
| 3 | | |
| 4 | | |
| 5 | *E-FILED - 11/10/09* | |
| 6 | | |
| 7 | | |
| 8 | | |
| 9 | IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT | |
| 10 | FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA | |
| 11 | MICHAEL ANCELO LENA No. C 00 2007 DMW (DD) | |
| 12 | MICHAEL ANGELO LENA,) No. C 09-2087 RMW (PR)) ORDER DENVING REQUEST | |
| 13 | Petitioner, ORDER DENYING REQUEST FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPEAL APPLITY: DENYING | |
| 14 | v.) APPEALABILITY; DENYING) MOTION TO PROCEED IN SUPREME COURT OF CALIFORNIA, et) FORMA PAUPERIS WITHOUT | |
| 15 | al., PREJUDICE | |
| 16 | Respondents.) (Docket No. 27) | |
| 17 | | |
| 18 | Petitioner, a Canadian prisoner proceeding <u>pro</u> <u>se</u> , filed a petition for writ of habeas | |
| 19 | corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241 alleging ineffective assistance of counsel among other | |
| 20 | things. On August 25, 2009, the court dismissed this action on abstention grounds, | |
| 21 | acknowledging that petitioner is incarcerated in Canada and raises claims arising from a pending | |
| 22 | criminal case in Marin County, California. Petitioner filed a timely notice of appeal. | |
| 23 | Upon the filing of a notice of appeal and a request for a certificate of appealability | |
| 24 | (COA), the district court shall indicate which specific issue or issues satisfy the standard for | |
| 25 | issuing a certificate, or state its reasons why a certificate should not be granted. See United | |
| 26 | States v. Asrar, 116 F.3d 1268, 1270 (9th Cir. 1997) (citing 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(3)). | |
| 27 | Although petitioner did not file a separate request for a certificate of appealability ("COA"), the | |
| 28 | Order Denying Request for Certificate of Appealability; Denying Motion to Proceed In Forma Pauperis Without Prejudice P:\PRO-SE\SJ.Rmw\HC.09\Lena087denCOA.wpd | |

Case 5:09-cv-02087-RMW Document 30 Filed 11/10/09 Page 2 of 2

court construes his notice of appeal as such. See Asrar, 116 F.3d at 1270.

The court concludes that petitioner has not shown "that jurists of reason would find it debatable whether the petition states a valid claim of the denial of a constitutional right and that jurists of reason would find it debatable whether the district court was correct in its procedural ruling." Slack v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000). Accordingly, petitioner's request for a certificate of appealability is DENIED.

In view of the denial of the COA, petitioner's motion to proceed in forma pauperis on appeal will be denied without prejudice to renewing the motion in the Court of Appeal if it grants a COA.

The clerk shall serve notice of this order forthwith to the United States Court of Appeal and to the parties. <u>See</u> Fed. R. App. P. 24(a).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

| DATED: | 11/6/09 |
|--------|---------|
|--------|---------|

Konald M. Whyte RONALD M. WHYTE United States District Judge

Order Denying Request for Certificate of Appealability; Denying Motion to Proceed In Forma Pauperis Without Prejudice

P:\PRO-SE\SJ.Rmw\HC.09\Lena087denCOA.wpd